

EXHIBIT C-A

Turke & Strauss LLP Firm Bio

Turke & Strauss LLP

613 Williamson Street, Suite 201
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
P: 608.237.1775
F: 608.237.4423
www.turkestrauss.com

Our Firm

Turke & Strauss is a law firm based in Madison, Wisconsin that focuses on complex civil and commercial litigation with an emphasis on consumer protection, data privacy, data breach, employment, wage and hour, business, and real estate matters. The attorneys of Turkey & Strauss have extensive experience in complex litigation, including class actions. The attorneys of Turkey & Strauss have prosecuted a variety of multi-million-dollar consumer fraud, product defect, privacy, and antitrust class actions and served as class counsel in cases at the federal level. The defendants in these cases have included companies such as Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc., The Clorox Company, Best Buy, Monsanto Company, Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group, LLC, Stearns Lending, LLC, Fiat Chrysler Automobiles, and American Power & Gas.

Our Cases

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Fowler, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (N.D. Cal.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who were overcharged fees on FHA mortgages. The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$30,000,000 in 2018, and final approval was granted in January 2019.

Walters v. Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group, LLP

Filed on behalf of consumers whose private information and personal identifiable information, including credit and debit card numbers, names, mailing addresses, and other personal information, was compromised and stolen from Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group by hackers. The case settled on a class-wide basis in 2018, and final approval was granted in July 2019.

Jones, et al. v. Monsanto Company (W.D. Mo.)

Filed on behalf of individuals who purchased mislabeled RoundUp® products. The case settled on a class-wide basis in 2020 for \$39,550,000. Final approval was granted in May 2021 and the case is currently on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit.

Crawford, et al. v. FCA US LLC (E.D. Mich.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who purchased or leased Dodge Ram 1500 and 1500 Classic vehicles equipped with 3.0L EcoDiesel engines between 2013 and 2019. Plaintiffs allege unfair, deceptive, and fraudulent practices in the Defendants' marketing and sale of vehicles with allegedly defective EGR coolers. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan.

In re: Chrysler-Dodge-Jeep EcoDiesel Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation (N.D. Cal.)

Filed on behalf of consumers against Fiat Chrysler and Bosch alleging unfair, deceptive, and fraudulent practices in the Defendants' marketing and sale of certain EcoDiesel vehicles. The class contained over 100,000 vehicles, including 2014-2016 model-year Jeep Grand Cherokees and Dodge Ram 1500 trucks that were allegedly outfitted with devices that masked actual emission levels. The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$307,500,000, and final approval was granted in May 2019.

Rolland, et al. v. Spark Energy, LLC (D.N.J.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who were forced to pay considerably more for their electricity than they should otherwise have paid due to Spark Energy's deceptive pricing practices. Plaintiff alleges that Spark Energy engages in a bait-and-switch deceptive marketing scheme luring consumers to switch utility companies by offering lower than local utility rates. These lower rates are fixed for only a limited number of months and then switch to a variable market rate that is significantly higher than the rates local utilities charge. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey.

Haines v. Washington Trust Bank (Wash. Sup. Ct., King Cty.)

Turke & Strauss represents consumers who were charged \$35 overdraft fees by Washington Trust Bank on accounts that were never actually overdrawn. Plaintiff filed suit against Washington Trust Bank for the unfair and unlawful assessment of these overdraft fees. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2021, and is final approval was granted in November 2021.

Pryor v. Eastern Bank (Mass. Sup. Ct., Suffolk Cty.)

Turke & Strauss represents consumers who were charged \$35 overdraft fees by Eastern Bank on accounts that were never actually overdrawn. Plaintiff filed suit against Eastern Bank for the unfair and unlawful assessment of these overdraft fees. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2021, and final approval was granted in March 2021.

Benanav, et al. v. Healthy Paws Pet Insurance LLC (W.D. Wash.)

Turke & Strauss represents consumers who were deceived by Healthy Paws Pet Insurance, an insurance provider that markets and administers pet insurance policies, regarding the true cost of its pet insurance policies. Plaintiffs allege that purchasers of Healthy Paws Pet Insurance's policies found that their policy premiums increased drastically from year to year, at a rate far outpacing the general costs of veterinary medicine, despite Healthy Paws Pet Insurance's representations to the contrary. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington.

DATA BREACH

Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc. (Wis. Cir. Ct., Milwaukee Cty.)

Filed on behalf of employees of Aurora Advocate Health, the 10th largest not-for-profit integrated health care system in the United States, whose personally identifiable information was breached and stolen through an email phishing campaign beginning in January 2020. Many of these individuals have lost time

and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case is currently on appeal to the Wisconsin Court of Appeals.

Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc. (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)

Turke & Strauss represents a class of consumers whose personal health information was compromised and stolen from Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc., a Houston-based billing and collections services firm that provides billing and collection services to healthcare providers across the country. Many of these consumers have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2021 and its final approval was granted in July 2022.

Kunkelman v. The Curators of The University of Missouri d/b/a MU Health Care (Mo. Cir. Ct., Boone Cty.)

Turke & Strauss represents a class of consumers whose personal health information, including names, dates of birth, social security numbers, medical record numbers, health insurance information, and treatment or clinical information, was compromised and stolen from University of Missouri Health Care. Many of these consumers have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case is currently pending in the Circuit Court of Boone County, Missouri.

DATA PRIVACY

Patterson v. Respondus, Inc., et al. (N.D. Ill.) and Bridges v. Respondus, Inc., et al. (N.D. Ill.)

Filed on behalf of all persons who took an exam using Respondus' online exam proctoring software, Respondus Monitor, in the state of Illinois. Plaintiffs allege that Respondus collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. Both cases are currently pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Duerr, et al. v. Bradley University (C.D. Ill.)

Turke & Strauss represents a class of Bradley University students located in the state of Illinois who were required to take exams using Respondus Monitor, which collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. Plaintiffs allege that Bradley University collects students' biometric identifiers and biometric

information without written consent and without legally compliant written public policies. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois.

Powell v. DePaul University (N.D. Ill.)

Turke & Strauss represents a class of DePaul University students located in the state of Illinois who were required to take exams using Respondus Monitor, which collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. Plaintiff alleges that DePaul University collects students' biometric identifiers and biometric information without written consent and without legally compliant written public policies. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Doe v. Chamberlain University (Il. Cir. Ct., Cook Cty.)

Turke & Strauss represents a class of Chamberlain University students located in the state of Illinois who were required to take exams using Respondus Monitor, which collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. Plaintiff alleges that Chamberlain University collects students' biometric identifiers and biometric information without written consent and without legally compliant written public policies. This case is currently pending in the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois.

Fee v. Illinois Institute of Technology (N.D. Ill.)

Turke & Strauss represents a class of DePaul University students located in the state of Illinois who were required to take exams using Respondus Monitor, which collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. Plaintiff alleges that DePaul University collects students' biometric identifiers and biometric information without written consent and without legally compliant written public policies. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Harvey v. Resurrection University (N.D. Ill.)

Turke & Strauss represents a class of Resurrection University students located in the state of Illinois who were required to take exams using Respondus Monitor, which collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. Plaintiff alleges that Resurrection University collects students' biometric identifiers and biometric information without written consent and without legally compliant written public

policies. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Evans v. American Power & Gas, LLC, et al. (S.D. Ohio)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated solicitation telephone calls on their cellular telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$6,000,000, and final approval was granted in May 2019.

Murray, et al. v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh (D. Mass.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated solicitation telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$14,000,000 in 2020. Final approval was granted in October 2021 and the case is currently on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

Baldwin, et al. v. Miracle-Ear, Inc., et al. (D. Minn.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated or prerecorded telemarketing telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* The case settled on a class-wide basis in 2021 and final approval is pending in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota.

Goodell, et al. v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC (D. Az.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated solicitation telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona.

Dickson v. Direct Energy, LP, et al. (N.D. Ohio)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated or prerecorded telemarketing telephone calls on their cellular telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case is currently on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Clemons v. O'Neil Insurance Company, Inc., et al. (E.D. Mo.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received telemarketing telephone calls on their cellular telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

Our Professionals

SAMUEL J. STRAUSS

Samuel J. Strauss is a founding member of Turke & Strauss LLP. Mr. Strauss concentrates his practice in class action litigation with an emphasis on consumer protection and privacy issues. Mr. Strauss has a national practice and appears in federal courts across the country. Over the course of his career, Mr. Strauss has represented plaintiffs in cases which have resulted in the recovery of hundreds of millions of dollars for consumers.

Mr. Strauss received his J.D. with honors from the University of Washington School of Law in 2013. Prior to forming Turke & Strauss in 2016, Mr. Strauss was an associate at Terrell Marshall Law Group in Seattle, Washington, where he successfully prosecuted complex class actions in federal and state courts.

Mr. Strauss is a member of bars of the states of Washington, Wisconsin, and Illinois and has been admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington, United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

In recent years, Mr. Strauss has been actively involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Murray v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, Case No. 19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Baldwin v. Miracle-Ear, Inc.*, Case No. 20-cv-01502 (D. Minn.)
- *Goodell v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC*, Case No. 20-cv-01657 (D. Az.)
- *Weister v. Vantage Point AI, LLC*, Case No. 21-cv-01250 (M.D. Fla.).
- *Rose v. New TSI Holdings, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-05519 (S.D. N.Y.)
- *Lang v. Colonial Penn Life Insurance Company*, Case No. 21-cv-00165 (N.D. Fla.)
- *Clemens v. O'Neil Insurance Company, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-00678 (E.D. Mo.)
- *Boshears v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-01222 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Martinez v. ZoomInfo Technologies Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-05725 (W.D. Wash.)

- *Uhhariet v. MyLife.com, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-08229 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kellman v. Spokeo, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-08976 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Patterson v. Respondus, Inc.*, Case No. 20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Bridges v. Respondus, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-01785 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-1220 (D. Minn.)
- *Crawford v. FCA US LLC*, Case No. 20-cv-12341 (E.D. Mich.)
- *Klaehn, et al. v. Cali Bamboo, LLC*, Case No. 19-cv-01498 (S.D. Cal.)
- *Jones v. Monsanto Company*, Case No. 19-cv-00102 (W.D. Mo.)
- *Dickson v. Direct Energy, LP, et al.*, Case No. 18-cv-00182 (N.D. Ohio)
- *Rolland v. Spark Energy, LLC*, Case No. 17-cv-02680 (D.N.J.)
- *Evans v. American Power & Gas, LLC*, Case No. 17-cv-00515 (S.D. Ohio)
- *Fowler v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, Case No. 17-cv-02092 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Wilkins v. HSBC Bank Nevada, N.A., et al.*, Case No. 14-cv-00190 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Ott v. Mortgage Investors Corporation*, Case No. 14-cv-00645 (D. Or)
- *Booth v. AppStack, et al.*, Case No. 13-cv-01533 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Melito v. American Eagle Outfitters, Inc.*, Case No. 14-cv-02440-VEC (S.D.N.Y.)
- *Spencer v. FedEx Ground Package System, Inc.*, Case No. 14-2-30110-3 SEA (Wa. Sup. Ct., King Cty.)

MARY C. TURKE

Mary C. Turke is a founding member of Turke & Strauss. Ms. Turke concentrates her practice in civil and commercial litigation. Ms. Turke regularly prosecutes consumer class actions, including those involving violations of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act and the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. Mr. Turke has extensive experience representing parties in multi-national disputes in both state and federal courts throughout the United States.

Ms. Turke received her J.D. *cum laude* from the University of Wisconsin Law School, Order of the Coif, in 1996. Prior to forming Turke & Strauss in May 2016, Ms. Turke was the managing partner of the Madison, Wisconsin, office of Michel Best & Friedrich LLP, where she practiced civil litigation. Ms. Turke is an active member of the Wisconsin State Bar. Ms. Turke has repeatedly been named to the annual Wisconsin Super Lawyers list (2011-2021) by SuperLawyers Magazine as well as The Best Lawyers in America® list (2013-2020) by Woodward/White, Inc. In 2017, shortly after forming Turke & Strauss, Ms. Turke received the Legal Innovator Award from the Wisconsin State Bar.

Ms. Turke is a member of the Wisconsin State Bar and has been admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

In recent years, Ms. Turke has been substantially involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Patterson v. Respondus, Inc.*, Case No. 1:20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc.*, Case No. 20CV2361 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Branch 22, Milwaukee Cty.)
- *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, Case No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)
- *Murray v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, Case No. 1:19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Goodell, et al. v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC*, Case No. 2:20-cv-01657 (D. Az.)
- *Doe v. Northwestern University*, Case No. 1:21-cv-01579 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Duerr v. Bradley University*, Case No. 1:21-cv-01096-SLD-JEH (C.D. Ill.)
- *Bridges v. Respondus, Inc.*, Case No. 1:21-cv-01785 (N.D. Ill.)

- *Powell v. DePaul University*, Case No. 1:21-cv-03001 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Doe v. Chamberlain University*, Case No. 2021CH01183 (Ill. Cir. Ct., Cook Cty.)
- *Fee v. Illinois Institute of Technology*, Case No. 1:21-cv-02512 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Harvey v. Resurrection University*, Case No. 1:21-cv-03203 (N.D. Ill.)

RAINA C. BORRELLI

Raina C. Borrelli is a partner at Turke & Strauss whose practice focuses on complex class action litigation, including data-breach, Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), false advertising, and consumer protection cases in both state and federal courts around the country. Ms. Borrelli has substantial experience leading discovery teams in these complex class action matters, as well as in working with class damages experts and class damages models in consumer protection cases.

Ms. Borrelli received her J.D. *magna cum laude* from the University of Minnesota Law School in 2011. Prior to joining Turke & Strauss, Ms. Borrelli was a partner at Gustafson Gluek, where she successfully prosecuted complex class actions in federal and state courts. Ms. Borrelli is an active member of the Minnesota Women's Lawyers and the Federal Bar Association, where she has assisted in the representation of *pro se* litigants through the *Pro Se* Project. Ms. Borrelli has repeatedly been named to the annual Minnesota "Rising Star" Super Lawyers list (2014-2021) by SuperLawyers Magazine. She has also been repeatedly certified as a North Star Lawyer by the Minnesota State Bar Association (2012-2015; 2018-2020) for providing a minimum of 50 hours of pro bono legal services.

Ms. Borrelli is a member of the Minnesota State Bar Association and has been admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

In recent years, Ms. Borrelli has been substantially involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Baldwin v. Miracle-Ear, Inc.*, Case No. 20-cv-01502 (D. Minn.)
- *Murray, et al. v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, Case No. 1:19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Goodell v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC*, Case No. 20-cv-01657 (D. Az.)
- *Rose v. New TSI Holdings, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-05519 (S.D. N.Y.)
- *Lang v. Colonial Penn Life Insurance Company*, Case No. 21-cv-00165 (N.D. Fla.)
- *Clemens v. O'Neil Insurance Company, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-00678 (E.D. Mo.)
- *In re Netgain Technology, LLC Consumer Data Breach Litigation*, Case No.

21-cv-01210 (D. Minn.)

- *Martinez v. ZoomInfo Technologies Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-05725 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Boshears v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-01222 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Patterson v. Respondus, Inc.*, Case No. 1:20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Bridges v. Respondus, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 1:21-cv-01785 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-1220 (JRT/KMM) (D. Minn.)
- *Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc.*, Case No. 20CV2361 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Branch 22, Milwaukee Cty.)
- *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, Case No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)
- *Kunkelman v. Curators of the University of Missouri, d/b/a MU Health Care*, Case No. 21BA-CV00182 (Mo. Cir. Ct., Boone Cty.)
- *Reese v. Teen Challenge Training Center, Inc.*, Case No. 00093 (Philadelphia Ct. Common Pleas)
- *Duerr, et al. v. Bradley University*, Case No. 1:21-cv-01096-SLD-JEH (C.D. Ill.)
- *Powell v. DePaul University*, Case No. 1:21-cv-03001 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Doe v. Chamberlain University*, Case No. 2021CH01183 (Ill. Cir. Ct., Cook Cty.)
- *Fee v. Illinois Institute of Technology*, Case No. 1:21-cv-02512 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Harvey v. Resurrection University*, Case No. 1:21-cv-03203 (N.D. Ill.)
- *In re FCA Monostable Gearshifts Litig.*, Case No. 16-md-02744 (E.D. Mich.)
- *Zeiger v. WellPet LLC*, Case No. 17-cv-04056 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Wyoming v. Procter & Gamble*, Case No. 15-cv-2101 (D. Minn.)
- *In re Big Heart Pet Brands Litig.*, Case No. 18-cv-00861 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Sullivan v. Fluidmaster*, Case No. 14-cv-05696 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Rice v. Electrolux Home Prod., Inc.*, Case No. 15-cv-00371 (M.D. Pa.)
- *Gorczynski v. Electrolux Home Products, Inc.*, Case No. 18-cv-10661 (D.N.J.)
- *Reitman v. Champion Petfoods*, Case No. 18-cv-1736 (C.D. Cal.)
- *Reynolds, et al., v. FCA US, LLC*, Case No. 19-cv-11745 (E.D. Mich.)

BRITTANY RESCH

Brittany Resch is an associate at Turke & Strauss. Ms. Resch's practice focuses on complex class action litigation, including antitrust litigation, data-breach, Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), false advertising, and consumer protection cases in both state and federal courts around the country. Ms. Resch has substantial experience managing discovery in these complex class action matters.

Ms. Resch received her J.D. from the University of Minnesota Law School in 2015. Prior to joining Turke & Strauss, Ms. Resch was an associate at Gustafson Gluek, where she successfully prosecuted complex class actions in federal and state courts. Ms. Resch also clerked for the Honorable Richard H. Kyle, Senior United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota. Ms. Resch is an active member of the Minnesota Women's Lawyers and the Federal Bar Association, where she has assisted in the representation of *pro se* litigants through the *Pro Se* Project.

Ms. Resch is a member of the Minnesota State Bar Association and has been admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota.

In recent years, Ms. Resch has been substantially involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Goodell v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC*, Case No. 20-cv-01657 (D. Az.)
- *Clemens v. O'Neil Insurance Company, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-00678 (E.D. Mo.)
- *Benedetto v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority*, Case No. 210201425 (C.C.P. Phila.)
- *Boshears v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-01222 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Martinez v. ZoomInfo Technologies Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-05725 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Uhhariet v. MyLife.com, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-08229 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kellman v. Spokeo, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-08976 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Mackey v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, Case No. 22-cv-00342 (N.D. Ill.)
- *DeBose v. Dun & Bradstreet Holdings, Inc.*, Case No. 22-cv-00209 (D. N.J.)
- *Emmrich v. General Motors LLC*, Case No. 21-cv-05990 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Spindler v. General Motors LLC*, Case No. 21-cv-09311 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Patterson v. Respondus University, et al.*, Case No. 1:20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Bridges v. Respondus University, et al.*, Case No. 1:21-cv-01785 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-1220 (JRT/KMM) (D.

Minn.)

- *Benanav, et al. v. Healthy Paws Pet Insurance, LLC*, Case No. 2:20-cv-00421-RSM (W.D. Wash.)
- *In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 16-cv-08637 (N.D. Ill.)
- *In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 15-md-02626 (M.D. Fla.)
- *In re Pork Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 21-md-02998 (D. Minn.)
- *In re DPP Beef Litigation*,
- *In re Asacol Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 15-cv-12730 (D. Mass.)
- *In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 12-md-02311 (E.D. Mich.)

ALEX S. PHILLIPS

Alex Phillips is an associate at Turke & Strauss. Mr. Phillips concentrates his practice in complex class action litigation and commercial litigation. He has represented both plaintiffs and defendants in high stakes litigation. Mr. Phillips has successfully obtained trial verdicts on behalf of his clients as well as negotiated numerous high-value settlements.

Mr. Phillips received his J.D. from the University of Wisconsin School of Law in 2017 and has been an active member of the Wisconsin State Bar as well as the Dane, Jefferson, and Dodge County Bar Associations.

In recent years, Mr. Phillips has been involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Murray, et al. v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, Case No. 1:19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Spindler v. General Motors LLC*, Case No. 21-cv-09311 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kellman v. Spokeo, Inc.*, Case No. 21-cv-08976 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc.*, Case No. 20CV2361 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Branch 22, Milwaukee Cty.)
- *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, Case No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-1220 (D. Minn.)
- *Dickson v. Direct Energy, LP, et al.*, Case No. 18-cv-00182 (N.D. Ohio)
- *Benanav, et al. v. Healthy Paws Pet Insurance, LLC*, Case No. 20-cv-00421 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Klaehn, et al. v. Cali Bamboo, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 19-cv-01498 (S.D. Cal.)
- *Sundermann v. Ryan Rolf*, Case No. 19-cv-00140 (S.D. Iowa)
- *Rugg v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc.*, Case No. 17-cv-05010 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Mackey v. IDT Energy, Inc.*, Case No. 18-cv-06756 (N.D. Ill.)

ZOG BEGOLLI

Zog Begolli is an associate at Turke & Strauss. Mr. Begolli concentrates his practice in complex class action litigation, with an emphasis on cases involving the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act, various states' consumer protection acts, and financial industry regulations.

Mr. Begolli received his J.D. from the University of Wisconsin School of Law in 2017 and is an active member of the Wisconsin State Bar. During law school, Mr. Begolli was a member of the University of Wisconsin Law and Entrepreneurship Clinic, which provides legal services to nascent entrepreneurs and early stage companies.

In recent years, Mr. Begolli has been actively involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Baldwin v. Miracle-Ear, Inc.*, Case No. 20-cv-01502 (JRT/HB) (D. Minn.)
- *Murray v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, Case No. 19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Patterson v. Respondus, Inc.*, Case No. 1:20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc.*, Case No. 20CV2361 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Branch 22, Milwaukee Cty.)
- *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, Case No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)
- *Reese v. Teen Challenge Training Center, Inc.*, Case No. 00093 (Philadelphia Ct. Common Pleas)
- *Crawford, et al. v. FCA US LLC*, Case No. 20-cv-12341 (E.D. Mich.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-1220 (D. Minn.)
- *Klaehn, et al. v. Cali Bamboo, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 19-cv-01498 (S.D. Cal.)
- *Fowler, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, Case No. 17-cv-02092 (N.D. Cal.)